1	James E. Whitmire, Esq. (NV Bar No. 653	33)
2	SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH, KEARNEY, HOLLEY & THOMPSON	
3	400 S. Fourth Street, Third Floor	
4	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: 702-791-0308	
5	Facsimile: 702-791-1912	
	jwhitmire@nevadafirm.com	
6	Of Counsel: Robert F. Green	
7	Christopher T. Griffith	
8	Salim A. Hasan Kate M. Lesciotto	
9	LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.	
10	Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900 180 N. Stetson Avenue	
11	Chicago, IL 60601-6731	
12	Telephone: 312-616-5600 Facsimile: 312-616-5700	
13	rgreen@leydig.com	
	cgriffith@leydig.com shasan@leydig.com	
14	klesciotto@leydig.com	
15	Attorneys for Defendants Lupin Limited	
16	and Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	
17	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
18	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
19	BAYER SCHERING PHARMA AG &	
20	BAYER HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS INC.,	
21	TIME TO THE THE TAX TO	
Ш	Plaintiffs,	Civil Case No. 2:10-cv-1166-GMN-RJJ
22	v.	
23	LUPIN LIMITED and LUPIN	
24	PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,	
25	Defendants.	
26		
27	<u>DEFENDANTS LUPIN LIMITED'S AND LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.'S</u> REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL "CONFIDENTIAL" REPLY IN	
28	SUPPORT OF THE JOINT MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE	

08837-01/660659

28

Defendants Lupin Limited and Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc. respectfully request leave to file under seal "Confidential" Reply in Support of the Joint Motion to Consolidate that was previously filed with the Court. In support of this Motion, Defendants state:

- 1. The public interest in full disclosure of documents is limited to ensuring the "public understanding of both the judicial process and significant public events." *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 172 (9th Cir. 2006). When a party requests a court to seal a document, the Court must balance the compelling reason for sealing the document with the public interest favoring disclosure. *Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665 (9th Cir. 2010). Documents will be sealed where compelling reasons "outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure" *Kamakana*, 447 F. 3d at 1178-1179.
- 2. Compelling reasons exist for sealing documents where their disclosure may "gratify private spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets." *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179.
- 3. In Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc., 98 S. Ct. 1306 (1973), the United States Supreme Court recognized that one of the fundamental basis for a district court to use its substantial discretion to permit the filing of a documents under seal was to protect a litigant's business information that might harm the litigant's competitive standing.
- 4. In determining whether documents should be sealed, a court should consider whether "disclosure of the material could result in improper use of the material for ... purposes of infringement upon trade secrets" Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting Hagestad v. Tragesser, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)).
- 5. In this matter, the parties have submitted a Stipulated Protective Order, which has not yet been approved by the Court (Dkt. 13).
- 6. As the Stipulated Protective Order has not yet been executed, and given that the Reply to the Opposition to Motion to Consolidate contains Defendants' confidential business and technical information, request is hereby made that Defendants be allowed to file under seal the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Confidential Version of the Reply.¹

- 7. Defendants would suffer potential irreparable harm should the redacted portions of their Reply become part of the public record.
- 8. Defendants will coordinate providing an un-redacted version of the Reply for the Court's in camera consideration prior to a ruling on this Motion. In addition, an un-redacted version of the Reply will be served on opposing counsel in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2010

/s/ James E. Whitmire

James E. Whitmire (NV Bar No. 6533)

SANTORO, DRIGGS, WALCH, KEARNEY,

HOLLEY & THOMPSON

400 S. Fourth Street, Third Floor

Las Vegas, NV 89101

Telephone: 702-791-0308 Facsimile: 702-791-1912 jwhitmire@nevadafirm.com

Of Counsel:

Robert F. Green Christopher T. Griffith Salim A. Hasan Kate M. Lesciotto Leydig, Voit & Mayer, Ltd. Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900 180 N. Stetson Avenue Chicago, IL 60601-6731 Telephone: 312-616-5600 Facsimile: 312-616-5700 rgreen@leydig.com cgriffith@leydig.com shasan@leydig.com klesciotto@leydig.com

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATE: OCT. 26, 2010

Attorneys for Defendants Lupin Limited and Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

¹ The Confidential Reply contains approximately one paragraph of information that needs to be kept confidential and the corresponding Exhibit that supports the Reply.